

# Greater Hilltop Area Plan Amendment

## DRAFT Text Survey Results

The following draft text was developed based on input received on Public Workshops #1, the Planning Division's Guide to Area and Neighborhood Planning (available at [www.columbus.gov](http://www.columbus.gov)) and Working Committee input.

The following responses were collected at the December 8, 2009 Public Workshop and through the online survey on the Plan Website.

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
<b>Neighborhoods will have a vibrant mix of uses (residential, retail, office, etc...).</b>	Mixed use development should be common on Hilltop's primary corridors and include multi-family housing, retail, offices, and other services that contribute to a walkable environment.	Neighborhood-scale mixed use (retail, office, multi-family) is recommended for Broad Street, from Whitethorne Avenue west to railroad underpass. The intersections of Broad Street and Westgate Avenue; Broad Street and Powell Avenue; and Broad Street and Wheatland Avenue may serve as mixed use redevelopment opportunities.	61	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided residents and business owners are given ample time for their input.</li> <li>• Why not have the so called Taco Wagons removed from just about every corner or vacant lot. On any given day or night, you see a gathering of people there eating outside on chairs. This is not a public picnic area, go to a park. Personally, they are so degrading to this part of Columbus. If they wish to sell such food, then open a restaurant. You don't see these wagons sitting in New Albany, Reynoldsburg, Westerville or Worthington, or even in Downtown.</li> <li>• No HUD or low income housing</li> <li>• Retail, office - ok; fix up existing homes/apts</li> <li>• No Section 8 or low income/HUD</li> <li>• No low income/HUD housing</li> <li>• This recommendation is suitable, aside from the implied potential for multi-family structure. A Park on vacant area of N. Wheatland is the only acceptable repurpose. Existing residential structure improvement incentives should take precedence over redevelopment on this block.</li> <li>• No more living space is needed.</li> <li>• No more living space is needed.</li> <li>• Retail &amp; office should be of primary precedent, with an emphasis on independent businesses rather than strip malls that generally propagate loitering by vagrants, gang members and other less than desirable elements.</li> <li>• develop with parking/bikeway/pedestrian walkways, traffic buffers on palmetto at blvd sts, sidewalks e-w to West High from Wayne</li> <li>• This is good to put in writing but it seems like that is what is there now.</li> <li>• Condos above the businesses would be cool</li> <li>• This most effects my neighborhood &amp; I support it. My future restaurant will be at the corner of Algonquin &amp; W. Broad &amp;</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<p>this will be a nice mix.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area is highly underserved with regards to retail options. Dining, general retail and other like uses are sought after by many residents in the area, and hope one day to see this turn into a reality.</li> <li>• As a new resident of the area, I feel the neighborhood-scale mixed use would benefit residents and the community (and Columbus as a whole) most. I think this area has beautiful homes that people like myself are interested in renovating, if only the retail area did not look like a slum. I really feel there is no reason for Broad Street to look the way it does. Attract more homeowners by enhancing and protecting the retail areas, and more business owners will come.</li> <li>• As long as the retail and offices spaces help support the needs of the neighborhood.</li> <li>• I would like to see the buildings remain in the proper style of architecture for the time period Westgate was built.</li> <li>• It is a shopping area now surrounded by homes. I see no reason to rock the boat at this area.</li> <li>• I would prefer we stick with small retail type of shops and small offices. I don't want to see more apartments Broad Street. I am open to higher-end Condos though if mixed with small shops on first and/or second level.</li> </ul>
		Community-scale mixed use (retail, office and multi-family) is recommended for the northeast and northwest corners of Broad Street and Wilson Road. Support continued use of larger retail centers with possible infill of additional retail, office, or multifamily. On the northeast corner, also consider development of small medical office buildings along the Wilson Road frontage, encouraging medical offices as infill while preserving portions of the existing commercial strip.	50	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would rather have retail/office – nor more multi family dwellings</li> <li>• Support retail only</li> <li>• I like the idea of developing the Wilson Rd frontage. Green space should also be added.</li> <li>• Appropriate designation. Keep in mind, the needs of the current residential layout. Again, improvement should take prec. New commercial structures will benefit from res. improvements. Target will not relocate into areas with such high rate of dilapidation.</li> <li>• No more living space needed. Job producers needed.</li> <li>• No more living space needed. Job producers needed.</li> <li>• Medical businesses tend to attract professional caliber individuals. There should be a higher emphasis on multi-family residential developments within such a proximity. Due to the existence of multiple medical business entities, this could yield higher rents and henceforth drive the influx of higher quality chain and privately owned businesses to build nearby due to desirability.</li> <li>• should have bikeway pedestrian walkway access from street</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<p>to all buildings, bus way and express parking, Wilson road sidewalks south to Sullivant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding abundant green space to this area would be a BIG improvement</li> <li>• There is too much medical out here already.</li> <li>• Medical Offices between Mt. Carmel and Doctors' should be encouraged.</li> <li>• I don't feel the Hilltop needs any more medical buildings. This plaza is an eyesore, and the landowner should be forced to renovate. Finally, if the casino moves into the area, this problem has a better chance of taking care of itself without our tax dollars.</li> <li>• We don't need more medical buildings. Too many multi-family units will take away from people purchasing single family homes.</li> <li>• This is a shopping mall. Find other stores to join and make it whole again.</li> <li>• No more medical! They do not take pride in their property as they should. I would like to see something like what happened to the West side of Tremont Road across from Kingsdale Shopping Center.</li> <li>• No more multi-family is needed in this area! Regional retail or office is OK.</li> </ul>
		Regional-scale mixed use (retail, office, multi-family) is recommended for Westland Mall area. This area is not within the city of Columbus and is subject to the regulatory guidance of Franklin County. Improve access and connections to the surrounding neighborhood.	44	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tear down and grass it</li> <li>• Less parking – more mixed use concept</li> <li>• I am afraid to even go into Sears and I'm sure it won't be long before, they too, depart the building.</li> <li>• No more HUD housing</li> <li>• There are multi family units in the area that need razed/refurbished – would not want to add additional apts</li> <li>• Support improving access and connections</li> <li>• DO SOMETHING!</li> <li>• I don't think this area can support multi-family.</li> <li>• Appropriate. Potential for creating new career opportunities for qualified local residents.</li> <li>• No more living space needed. Job producing is wanted here.</li> <li>• No more living space needed. Job producing is wanted here.</li> <li>• I only support this suggestion from the position of not including residential development within close proximity of I-270. Higher crime levels usually are exhibited in these areas. Emphasis on chain retail and gas stations would be a likely candidate for developments in this area.</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>link to casino, sidewalk/walkway/bikeway to all buildings, park and rec area as part of development, sidewalks to Wilson on Broad</li> <li>This area should be retail and office only. Multi family is not needed with 70% vacancy of the apartments behind it</li> <li>I would like to see it used strictly for retail and office space.</li> <li>I think if the casino moves in, this problem may take care of itself. I'd like to wait and see what happens before jumping on this one.</li> <li>I can see this area going to hotels if the casino goes in at Delphi</li> <li>I support anything but a casino</li> <li>Let's put in a new mall like that of Easton. Once casino arrives the area will have enough traffic to support a new mall.</li> <li>This area does not need any more multi-family! Use the current multi-family (Lincoln Park West or whatever the current name is).</li> </ul>
		Regional-scale mixed use (retail, office, multi-family) is recommended for Broad Street from Phillipi Road west to I-270.	46	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Put it back as farmland</li> <li>Less industrial along W. Broad – it's out of place</li> <li>No more HUD housing</li> <li>Support retail, office only</li> <li>Seems like it IS mixed use now...</li> <li>I don't think this area can support multi-family.</li> <li>Too many empty rentals no more housing needed. Employment opportunities are wanted.</li> <li>Too many empty rentals no more housing needed. Employment opportunities are wanted.</li> <li>I only support this suggestion from the position of not including residential development within close proximity of I-270. Higher crime levels usually are exhibited in these areas. Emphasis on chain retail and gas stations would be a likely candidate for developments in this area.</li> <li>pedestrian walkway/bikeway/adequate parking building by building, broad st sidewalk, express bus parking</li> <li>Multi family is not needed in this area</li> <li>I would like to see it used strictly for retail and office space.</li> <li>This area is too far from the Hilltop community to benefit the residents.</li> <li>See the above comment</li> <li>This is a truck route. No one wants to hear semi-trucks 24/7.</li> <li>I support anything but a casino</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more multi-family here either. Everything else is acceptable.</li> </ul>
		Neighborhood-scale mixed use (single family, multifamily, office, retail) is recommended for Sullivant Avenue, east of Wilson Road, limiting retail to existing sites. Additional retail, if considered, should occur at major intersections.	57	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bike lanes would also be appropriate here as it's in the center of the Hilltop.</li> <li>No HUD/low income</li> <li>No HUD/low income housing</li> <li>Must preserve existing sites and buildings that once supported retail</li> <li>Perhaps appropriate location for multi-fam. if supported through incentive-based recalibration of retail. With potential casino, this is appropriate site for supportive establishments</li> <li>Shouldn't be restricted to major intersections only!</li> <li>Limit retail and retool regulations regarding retail signage. Some retail signs block street signs!</li> <li>I prefer the phrasing of this recommendation. It sounds like the goal is walkable retail. That should be the goal on the Hilltop--we don't all have cars!</li> <li>Leave it the way it is.</li> <li>Leave it the way it is.</li> <li>enlarge # of road lanes and make traffic byway to I70</li> <li>Retail should be encouraged on Broad and on Sullivant</li> <li>Sounds great.</li> <li>Something really should be done about Sullivant and the slum it has become.</li> </ul>
		North Hilltop – east of Wilson Road, north of railroad tracks: Support existing mix of land uses, with the portion east of Hague Avenue primarily light manufacturing. Limit retail to locations of existing retail on Hague Avenue. As opportunities arise, enhance buffering and screening (landscaping) to minimize potential conflicts and protect the streams with a buffer*, as shown.	49	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No manufacturing if you are serious re want to protect the streams.</li> <li>Only supportive to non-invasive, community supportive structure</li> <li>Leave it as it is.</li> <li>Leave it as it is.</li> <li>support bikeway projects, buffer neighborhoods, support parkland as part of project</li> <li>This recommendation would cause further deterioration of the residential neighborhoods. I certainly do not want to live near any more industrial/manufacturing.</li> </ul>
		North of Broad Street: Support mix of existing land uses with Medium Density Mixed residential as the primary land use. Protect the streams with a buffer* as shown as	51	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This implies improvement to residential area. Quite necessary, to be competitive</li> <li>This area can improve within its existing zoning framework.</li> <li>Build nothing along Wheatland, a park for now would be good.</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
		opportunities arise.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build nothing along Wheatland, a park for now would be good.</li> <li>introduce increased parkland along existing trails, bikeways and pedestrian trails to broad st, clean up alleys behind storefront, roadway blvds and traffic buffers</li> <li>This community does not need any more opportunity for multi-family homes. We have enough bad landlords who don't take care of their property now.</li> </ul>
		Wilson Road corridor, north of railroad tracks: Community commercial uses are recommended. Medium Density Mixed residential for the vacant property to the immediate east of the commercial corridor at Wilson and Fisher roads is recommended as a transition to the single family to the east.	44	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to stop building single family because the housing stock in Highland West will continue to stand empty and will never be considered as a _____ working class alternative to new builds</li> <li>Do not support medium density mixed residential</li> <li>Who would want to live that close to the RR? Which 'shake' up structures too literally so they will soon be slums. Or slum-looking.</li> <li>Appropriate. Especially if Casino is approved.</li> <li>Leave it as it is for now.</li> <li>Leave it as it is for now.</li> <li>We need more single-family homes, not apartments.</li> <li>This should include a stream buffer on Dry Run and maybe some park area.</li> </ul>
		Southeast corner of Wilson Road and Valleyview Drive (northern half of Greater Western Shopping Center): Employment Center uses are recommended.	52	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good alternative site for the casino as well</li> <li>YES</li> <li>Would like to see some of the lot returned to green space with a sidewalk on Valleyview.</li> <li>Highly recommend more opportunity for adult education.</li> <li>I strongly support this measure; I think this is the ideal area to try to attract decent jobs to the neighborhood.</li> <li>Job producing tenants needed.</li> <li>Job producing tenants needed.</li> <li>bikeway and pedestrian pathways, bus corridor up to center</li> </ul>
		Northwest quadrant of the Sullivant Avenue and Wilson Road intersection: Support continued mix of current land uses. Limit retail to existing retail locations. Existing light manufacturing sites should continue as light manufacturing or office related uses. Light manufacturing, office, or flex office should also be considered for	52	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BUFFERs needed NOW.</li> <li>Appropriate use within aesthetic boundaries. Landscape restructuring should be inclusive of much shrubbery/trees, etc.</li> <li>Leave it as it is.</li> <li>Leave it as it is.</li> <li>increased lanes in road to I70</li> <li>This support also includes maintaining current parkland.</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
		existing retail sites. As opportunities arise, utilize buffering and screening (landscaping) to minimize potential conflicts between land uses.			
		Regional-scale mixed use (retail, office, multi-family) is recommended for apartments on Georgesville Road, south of Westland Mall as a possible redevelopment opportunity and should be redeveloped following appropriate guidelines in the Plan, as well as under the regulatory guidance of Franklin County.	45	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit low-income HUD housing to this area where it already exists</li> <li>• Multi-family dwellings in dire need of rehab/or they should be replaced</li> <li>• No low income/HUD/Sec8. Tear down eyesore apts</li> <li>• No low income/Section8 housing – No</li> <li>• Sidewalks needed.</li> <li>• Very appropriate. Existing structure is sub-standard, and magnet for deviant activity. Reg-scale will also be supportive to casino.</li> <li>• Tear them down and look for employment producing opportunities.</li> <li>• Tear them down and look for employment producing opportunities.</li> <li>• link to casino, bus/bike/pedestrian corridors</li> <li>• Lots of green space and recreation areas would be beneficial here</li> <li>• Prefer retail and office with a VERY few multi-family.</li> <li>• Prefer retail and office with a VERY few multi-family.</li> <li>• I think tighter controls should be put on occupancy: number of people inhabiting one apartment</li> <li>• I can see this land being redeveloped to support a casino should it go on the Delphi site</li> <li>• At a minimum, tear them down. They are an embarrassment to the west side when driving on the freeway.</li> <li>• I support this if it includes the elimination of the current apartments there. They are a community nuisance and need to be torn down.</li> <li>• Redevelop with Casino.</li> <li>• This area really needs businesses brought back</li> </ul>
		Small-scale neighborhood retail is integrated within residential portions of the planning area east of Wilson Road and north of Briggs Road. If managed carefully, these uses can serve as an amenity for the community. Locations should be	50	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small neighborhood retail can be a huge plus for this area. Increases walking, convenience, etc.</li> <li>• Exactly as worded above is what I only support.</li> <li>• Would provide a stronger sense of neighborhood kinship. Convenience is key.</li> <li>• I support this with reservations, as any small businesses are welcome in the neighborhood.</li> </ul>



Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
		limited to existing storefronts. Evidence should be provided that the development would have minimal negative impact on the surrounding residential area in terms of parking, lighting, noise, graphics, or other potentially negative impacts.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave it as it is.</li> <li>• Leave it as it is.</li> </ul>
		The vacant commercial property at Briggs Road and Bronwyne Avenue: Support neighborhood - scale mixed use, office, smaller scale multi-family (townhouse style), or single family.	46	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean up homes that are there</li> <li>• NO MULTI-family housing here. Truly nice, stays nice neighborhood which multi-rentals will bring straight downhill w who will want to move in next to nice area. I support more single family homes. Or offices.</li> <li>• I want whatever punishes Tonti the most for abusing his neighbors.</li> <li>• Appropriate choice, since surrounding structures are mostly resident owned. Existing structures are comparable in value, to newly built condo.</li> <li>• tear down with or without plans-this has gone on too long without development, make it a park if necessary</li> <li>• Make it a park</li> <li>• I believe the area is to small and the roads are too. Maybe a good idea will be small park for the kids and some walking trials for our four legged friends.</li> <li>• This area should be kept strictly family dwellings, preferably smaller scale.</li> <li>• This should include some green space.</li> </ul>
	Highest densities should be focused on the area's primary corridors (Broad Street and Sullivant Avenue) in order to support transit and neighborhood retail, encourage a more walkable environment, and preserve the nature of the existing neighborhoods.	High density multi-family uses should be located on Broad Street and Sullivant and follow the density recommendations given below. These density recommendations are to be used as general guidelines. Each development should be judged on its own merits and must consider the specific site and the site's context (adjacent uses and development pattern). Some developments may merit a higher density, but specific rationale for support of such higher density should be provided.	41	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already plenty of housing contained in the neighborhoods – this is an attempt to move yet more eastside Sec. 8 clients to the west side and we will reject it</li> <li>• Broad St should have same parameters 16-24 as Sullivant</li> <li>• No building setbacks or historic demolitions</li> <li>• Adjacent neighborhoods are of dilapidated conditions, rendering appeal at a low. Consideration must be given to residential improvement incentives, before such a plan is reasonable.</li> <li>• I would like to see low density multi-family residence remain.</li> <li>• High Density housing is better suited to areas near community or regional retail space.</li> <li>• I hope for more residential density in the neighborhood. The pictured dwellings seem delightful.</li> <li>• No more housing needed.</li> </ul>



Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential densities along Broad Street should range from 16-45 dwelling units per acre.</li> <li>Residential densities along Sullivant Avenue should range from 16-24 dwelling units per acre.</li> <li>Proposals that include the highest end of the density ranges should include structured parking and be located at primary intersections and particularly scrutinized in regard to their contribution to street level activity, relationship to adjacent neighborhoods, building materials, and architecture.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more housing needed.</li> <li>no cheap construction, fit historical architecture, less density better</li> <li>no multi unit apts on broad street</li> <li>This seems pretty dense. What is going to happen to all of the abandoned housing in the neighborhoods behind these major streets?</li> <li>Any multi-family should not be Government subsidized, and if rental, number of occupants per dwelling limited. Also question the difference of dwelling unit number numbers between Sullivant and Broad per acre.</li> <li>Any multi-family should not be Government subsidized, and if rental, number of occupants per dwelling limited. Also question the difference of dwelling unit number numbers between Sullivant and Broad per acre.</li> <li>Nothing more than light to medium density please.</li> </ul>
	Future development patterns in areas that are generally single family should be developed at a density level consistent with the existing development.	Area generally to the south of Briggs Road: Low-Medium Density residential development is recommended. Enhance or create road, pedestrian and/or bicycle connections between neighborhoods and parks when possible. Create stream buffers* if opportunities arise.	46	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briggs must be connected to Clime by extending N/S streets</li> <li>Believe pedestrian &amp;/or bike connections already exist! No more new needed!</li> <li>This seems like a great place to invite larger-footprint businesses.</li> <li>Leave it as it is.</li> <li>Leave it as it is.</li> <li>Why not some sort of natural environment. No one in the area wants there to be a connector between clime and briggs for anything bigger than a bicycle.</li> </ul>
		Farmland on Briggs Road: Support existing use of crop farmland. In the event farming ceases, support single-family of Low-Medium Density residential with connections to surrounding neighborhoods and existing street grid where possible.	43	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hague Ave, Binns, etc. need extended to join the subdivisions that line Clime Road for better police coverage of all areas</li> <li>Support farmland only. If farming ceases – use as park – green space</li> <li>Do not develop open land</li> <li>Support Farmland (no more urban sprawl)</li> <li>Residential does not need to be expanded here.</li> <li>supportive incentive to gainfully increase potential growth is highly recommended</li> <li>Support-HOWEVER--SUPPORT FARMING FIRST! IT'S DIMINISHING TOO MUCH ALREADY!</li> <li>Keep our farmland.</li> <li>Definitely support existing cropland!</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the event farming ceases, invite large warehouse/factory businesses to the area.</li> <li>• Leave it as it is or create a park.</li> <li>• Leave it as it is or create a park.</li> <li>• Open space naturalized park land. Would be in walking distance of large residential areas. Community gardens also located in prime ag land.</li> <li>• I am not familiar with this area.</li> <li>• I do not support any sort of connections other than bike paths between briggs and clime.</li> </ul>
		The area south of Clime Road contains significant natural resources - streams, mature tree stands, etc. These resources should be protected through such techniques as sensitive site design and establishment of no-disturb easements. It is recognized that these conservation practices may impact potential development densities.	57	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not remove natural areas</li> <li>• YES</li> <li>• Excellent idea!</li> <li>• Let's preserve SOME Mother Nature, PLEASE!</li> <li>• Should be developed as park land maintaining existing characteristics as much as possible.</li> <li>• Make it a park to protect it.</li> <li>• Make it a park to protect it.</li> <li>• Natural resources should most definitely be protected from development and heavy governance through no-disturb easements is an excellent suggestion.</li> <li>• parkland is preferable</li> <li>• I am not familiar with this area.</li> <li>• absolutely support</li> <li>• Big Run definitely needs protection. It has not been well-protected in the past.</li> <li>• Great, consistent with surrounding jurisdictions.</li> </ul>
	Job centers with office and light manufacturing uses should be supported for new and expanding businesses.	The land use emphasis for industrial areas should continue to be employment based. Appropriate specific uses include light industrial, research and development, laboratories, warehouse distribution, and flex office space.	55	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support-UNLESS it's for Rec. C3, let's keep SOME nature NATURAL! Rekindle where already built!!!!</li> <li>• This suggestion is quite warranted.</li> <li>• What area is this?</li> <li>• Where?</li> </ul>
		While the existing commercial retail along West Broad Street is recognized, conversion to Employment Center uses consistent with urban design guidelines in the plan is recommended over time for	46	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area is perfect for an alternative site for the casino which most people in the area voted for.</li> <li>• This is also an excellent suggestion and should be pursued as is.</li> <li>• bikeways/pedestrian walkways/broad st sidewalks/ traffic blvd/trolley/mass transit Franklin Conservatory to Darby</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
		the portion from Phillipi Road to Soldano Boulevard, contingent upon the purchase of the entire site to be converted to Employment Center uses as a whole. The purpose of the Employment Center designation is to focus commercial retail at the intersection of Broad Street and Wilson Road and at Broad Street and I-270.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>canter</li> <li>retail ok for the entire length of w broad street</li> </ul>
		The vacant Delphi site: Employment Center uses including but not limited to: business and professional offices, technology park clusters, research and development, light industrial operations, and visitor service establishments are recommended.	42	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail development similar to Easton would be more appropriate to go with what is already there. Or Columbus could annex the site and that area could be used as the alternate casino site</li> <li>I support use of this site, to enhance the quality of living for residents of surrounding areas. If employment opportunities arise, I am not partial to any one recommendation.</li> <li>I support business and professional offices, tech park clusters, research and development, but NOT CASINOS.</li> <li>Please no casino!</li> <li>Casino here!</li> <li>This is an industrial site and should be used to attract light industrial jobs. Not casinos or other commercial uses.</li> <li>Casino</li> <li>Casino</li> <li>Quite acceptable suggestion.</li> <li>casino</li> <li>casino or light industry only</li> <li>Want to see the casino built on this property</li> <li>Leaning toward the casino</li> <li>Leaning toward the casino</li> <li>I do not support having a casino in this area</li> <li>Casino development</li> <li>Obviously, a casino should be part of the plan</li> <li>Voted to be used for casino?</li> <li>I'd prefer this are be reserved for casino use. The area could stand an injection in such revenue.</li> <li>I would like to see the casino go on the site, but this is a good alternative.</li> <li>I support anything but a casino</li> <li>Casino!!</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
<b>Open space and natural resources should be preserved and protected.</b>	<p>Natural areas should be preserved as integral components of development.</p> <p>Natural areas should be preserved as a part of public or private park and recreation systems.</p>	<p>The amount of impervious surfaces should be minimized in order to reduce stormwater flow and rates, and to facilitate stormwater infiltration.</p>	63	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support site for Casino.</li> <li>• Whole area is in need of greener purposes.</li> <li>• Seriously - let's give a helping hand to Mother Nature from time to time!!</li> <li>• Many expansive retail parking lots which are never filled to capacity should be re-structured to allow for more greenery.</li> <li>• Storm water runoff absorbing into the ground is an obvious concern in heavy urban areas. As we all know, automotive chemicals and other contaminants that will most obviously taint water tables and potentially cause increased health risks and city expenditures to purify or clean up.</li> <li>• Yes this over paving of large areas needs to be rethought out.</li> <li>• YES!!!!</li> <li>• I was able to provide "hard surface" parking while using recycled pavement which was cold-paved -- allowing some penetration rather than total runoff. But gravel should be encouraged.</li> </ul>
		<p>The natural corridors include the tributaries and streams of Greater Hilltop. Natural features within these areas should be preserved and enhanced over time as greenways and considered for acquisition. Stream buffers should be established according the stream corridor protection zone provisions defined in the city of Columbus <i>Stormwater Drainage Manual</i>. Streams that are currently diverted through culverts should be considered for "daylighting" as part of redevelopment of the site where economically feasible. "Daylighting" is a measure to restore the ravine to its natural state. This would both be a green approach to stormwater management and an attractive feature for a development</p>	61	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's a travesty that the city has neglected these areas for so long.</li> <li>• Concerns for liability when opening ravines</li> <li>• YES Please.</li> <li>• Thank you for this recommendation</li> <li>• Spot on.</li> <li>• IF I'm understanding, let's HELP Mother Nature help OURSELVES!!!!Keep Nature NATURAL AND BEAUTIFUL!!</li> <li>• Protect the streams and greenways.</li> <li>• Protect the streams and greenways.</li> <li>• Very important</li> <li>• This is great! Please also consider using rain gardens where feasible. Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District can assist. The Friends of the Scioto River can also assist.</li> </ul>
<b>New development will respect community</b>	New commercial and mixed use development should utilize design techniques to ensure that it	Consider the development of additional commercial overlay designations for the Greater Hilltop Area. Considerations include the	43	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more awareness of historic resources and architecture on Hilltop</li> <li>• This area needs incorporated into the existing over</li> <li>• The commercial overlay should definitely be extended to</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
character and historic features.	accommodates the pedestrian and bicyclist and is integrated with the existing fabric and scale of the given neighborhood.	Urban Commercial Overlay or Community Commercial Overlay on portions of Broad Street that are not currently covered by a Commercial Overlay. The Urban Commercial Overlay may also be appropriate for key intersections with commercial or mixed use development for intersections on Sullivant Avenue. The Regional Commercial Overlay may be appropriate for Wilson Road.			<p>enhance the historic character of the Hilltop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NO</li> <li>• NO</li> <li>• I don't fully understand the terminology but it sounds like you mapped what is already there.</li> <li>• I am not sure of the definitions of urban/community overlays. However, any development should have as the final result residential community blending with commercial business needs of the entire community.</li> <li>• I am not sure of the definitions of urban/community overlays. However, any development should have as the final result residential community blending with commercial business needs of the entire community.</li> <li>• I am not familiar with this.</li> </ul>
		<p>Until such time that an overlay may be implemented, the following guidelines should be utilized in the review of development applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A consistent level of detailing and finish should be provided for all sides of a building ("four-sided" architecture). Front elevations for retail buildings should be divided into increments to mimic traditional storefronts, consist of 50% or more glass windows at the street level and utilize a variety of treatments and human scale details.</li> <li>• Signs are recommended to be placed and sized on buildings such that they are in keeping with the scale and size of the building facades and general streetscape so as not to obscure or interfere with architectural lines and details.</li> <li>• Freeway, pole signs, billboards, "sign benches," roof signs, larger overhanging signs, LED and other such</li> </ul>	55	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike parking included in design</li> <li>• No historic demolitions</li> <li>• No demolition of historic buildings</li> <li>• Area in need of aesthetic enhancement.</li> <li>• Absolutely supported! These measures should go a long way to make the neighborhood more attractive.</li> <li>• Who will pay for these?</li> <li>• Who will pay for these?</li> <li>• but with stronger language about signage</li> <li>• Yes! Yes!! Yes!!!</li> <li>• This is what Westgate area needs! Let's do it!</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
		<p>electronic or digital signs, or excessively large signs that interfere with visual character are discouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings should be designed to address the street and enhance the pedestrian experience. Examples include the use of outdoor dining areas, transparent windows, or other means that emphasize human-scale design features at the ground floor level.</li> <li>• Buildings should be generally parallel to the street, with the primary façade facing the major street.</li> </ul>			
		Convenient, safe, well marked, and attractive pedestrian connections should be provided from the public street to commercial, office, mixed use and multi-family building entrances.	58	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are very few pedestrian x-ings on W Broad.</li> <li>• More info requested on this please.</li> <li>• More info requested on this please.</li> <li>• pedestrian walkways and sidewalks/bikeways</li> <li>• I don't care either way.</li> </ul>
		Adjacent parking lots should provide pedestrian connections to better utilize parking spaces in an area where parking is limited.	62	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking needs to be visible from the main thoroughfare for safety</li> <li>• At who's expense?</li> <li>• Safe parking/pedestrian connections imperative; don't take away natural beautiful land unnecessarily!!</li> <li>• Whose parking lots are these???</li> <li>• Whose parking lots are these???</li> </ul>
	Residential design guidelines should be used to protect the long-term quality and value of the community.	New housing design, housing additions and garages should be compatible with adjacent nearby housing design, and measured in terms of similar height and width, setbacks, but does not need to be duplicative of historic style.	56	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does need to be in conformity to what is already there</li> <li>• No Dominion cracker boxes</li> <li>• New homes should fit style of current homes</li> <li>• Prefer "duplicative of historic style"</li> <li>• Again, enhancements to existing structures should be considered. Incentives are sure to be beneficial to entire agenda.</li> <li>• this is a must</li> <li>• 100% true; if the neighborhood degenerates into uniform plastic houses, I will be distraught.</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will this be possible \$\$\$\$</li> <li>• How will this be possible \$\$\$\$</li> <li>• New housing design, housing additions and garages should be compatible with adjacent nearby housing design, and measured in terms of similar height and width, setbacks, but SHOULD need to be duplicative of historic style.</li> <li>• New housing, additions and garages should be duplicative of the historic style of each particular neighborhood, otherwise they look out of place and bring down the look (or what's left of it) of the area. The example shown is awful; I wouldn't want it across the street from my house. It looks like cheap post war housing. Anyone who has driven through the Hilltop has surely seen the "remuddling" projects that have gone on for years-- why encourage it in one of the largest and most architecturally varied communities?</li> </ul>
		The primary facade of new housing should face the public street.	63	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Done tastefully; homes should face main street of housing development.</li> <li>• this is a must</li> <li>• sidewalks required</li> </ul>
		Any new garage should be located behind the house if the site is accessed by an available alley. Otherwise, garage door openings facing a frontage should not exceed 40 percent of the width of the house façade (including the garage).	52	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• garage may replace existing garage under existing dimensions, garages may not be converted to housing but may have electricity if house torn down</li> <li>• There needs to be some middle ground here. I don't believe the garage should be huge but I don't want to prevent anyone such as an artist from opening a small studio. A large garage can be done with some sort of style. For instance, any doors over 9' wide must be made to look like the old fashion folding doors or something to that effect. Nothing is more ugly than a huge white garage door.</li> </ul>
		Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) - green building technologies, are encouraged for residential buildings.	54	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal choice should be respected. The city needs to stop promoting set agenda in these efforts such as this.</li> <li>• Totally.</li> <li>• As long as it doesn't raise my financial out-put &amp; taxes! for our future</li> <li>• How about providing low-interest loans to residents who want to get work done to their houses?</li> <li>• New builds? \$\$ to help existing property owners.</li> <li>• New builds? \$\$ to help existing property owners.</li> <li>• Either way is fine with me.</li> <li>• However, I do not want to get carried away with this type of program. We "encourage" these ideas not beat people over the head with them. This neighborhood has a modest income</li> </ul>



Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					per person so let's not price them out of the area or discourage them from improvements due to high cost of "green" technologies.
		Multi-family developments with 20 units+ should have more than one building type and/or façade option, providing a variety of façade treatments.	56	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more multi family. Put HUDs to the far west where much vacant land is available</li> <li>Do not need multifamily</li> <li>lower density and increased unit size desirable</li> <li>I don't care.</li> <li>I would rather not see these types of large structures in my neighborhood but if it came down to it I would support the above statement.</li> </ul>
		Housing developed on the primary corridors (Broad Street and Sullivant Avenue) as multi-family or mixed use/multi-family development should include design treatments such as the use of front stoops and/or porches, having primary building entrances fronting the street, the use of balconies that face the street, small plazas, etc to ensure they contribute to street life.	58	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more new multi family. Plenty of housing to develop on the side streets</li> <li>Need retail</li> <li>As long as there is no parking in front</li> <li>No low income multi-family units</li> <li>Provided their done tastefully &amp; safely!</li> <li>Not needed.</li> <li>Not needed.</li> <li>develop Sullivant as primary traffic corridor Georgesville to I70</li> <li>Not so sure about this one.</li> <li>Absolutely!</li> <li>I do feel this is important for a sense of community.</li> </ul>
	Parking needs should be balanced with the goal of reducing development's impact on the natural environment, as well as the goal of creating walkable and bikeable neighborhoods and encouraging the use of transit.	To the extent possible parking should be located to the rear or side of a building.	54	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As long as lots are patrolled</li> <li>For safety it needs to be visible</li> <li>Street parking needed on Broad</li> <li>Provided it's safe &amp; secure!</li> <li>This allows safe passage for cyclists and busses.</li> <li>Absolutely! Anything else is very suburban and will discourage new residents seeking that elusive "character".</li> <li>Good luck with that. Maybe with a new build.</li> <li>Good luck with that. Maybe with a new build.</li> <li>consider Broad St mal and road diversion bilaterally to alleys in commercial mall area Highland West</li> <li>we need all the parking we can get</li> </ul>
		Parking reductions may be appropriate for higher density, mixed use projects along Broad Street and/or other commercial areas served by transit.	36	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have too much parking west of Wilson</li> <li>Only if its warranted by study showing increase in COTA use</li> <li>Parking deficit east of Hague</li> <li>Business owners are discouraged now by talk of any reduction (Mobility Study)</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More parking is needed</li> <li>• No parking reductions on Broad</li> <li>• Keep on-street parking available – more transit options besides buses or bicycles</li> <li>• Not enough parking as is! Don't take away ANY!!!</li> <li>• We need a safe passageway for cyclists down W Broad. We cannot deny that they are as much of our "alternate means of transportation" as busses are.</li> <li>• NO</li> <li>• NO</li> <li>• express parking lots with bikeways ending at bus stops, broad st trolley/mass transit Darby Center to Franklin Conservatory</li> </ul>
		Shared parking arrangements should be encouraged, particularly between users with differing peak hours. Shared parking may only be implemented if a mechanism can be developed that is recognized and enforced by both the property owners and city of Columbus.	50	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking deficit east of Hague</li> <li>• Shared parking and liability/expenses</li> <li>• Public parking should be provided and maintained on city owned parking lots</li> <li>• No shared parking w/churches – too limiting</li> <li>• If both can agree - YEAY!! That's what I'M talkin' 'bout!!!!</li> <li>• For example, church parking lots remain empty Mon-Saturday, being used only for a couple of hours on Sunday. The majority of businesses are closed on Sunday.</li> <li>• Must be consensual.</li> <li>• Must be consensual.</li> <li>• That's exactly what we did to bring the Restaurant (Margo's) to the BZA.</li> <li>• Maximum use of available assets would be great.</li> <li>• Great idea. Good luck on getting anyone to go along with this.</li> </ul>
		Allow parking two lots deep on the north or south side of Broad Street where there is an existing alleyway if the development adheres to Urban Commercial Overlay (UCO). ( <i>West Broad Street Economic Development Strategy</i> )	48	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, only if the city widens the alleys and makes them safe with proper lighting, regarding and repairing</li> <li>• Alleys need upgrades</li> <li>• Must improve alleys, allow for building upgrades to rear, improve lighting</li> <li>• Residential not parking. Park on Broad – north &amp; south</li> <li>• Special consideration should be given to safety of pedestrians in night hours. If so, then its fine.</li> <li>• Don't understand this one!!!!</li> <li>• There needs to be usable designated parking off Broad.</li> <li>• This sounds like an effective use of space.</li> <li>• Where will the houses go????</li> <li>• Where will the houses go????</li> </ul>

Principles	Policies	Guidelines/Strategies	Support		Comments
			Yes	No	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encourage parking behind the buildings to improve street appeal</li> <li>• I don't understand this recommendation, so I disagree. If I could understand it better, I might be for it.</li> <li>• This is needed to allow for bicycle paths.</li> </ul>
		Parking lots are recommended to incorporate Low Impact Design (LID) features to minimize their impact on nearby waterways.	60	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No parking lots</li> <li>• Practical.</li> <li>• Sounds good - sound too good to be true????!!!!!!!</li> </ul>

\*Buffer: A buffer is the area along the stream where buildings are not constructed and natural vegetation is encouraged.

\*\*Commercial Overlays: Overlay are a special type of zoning district that establishes additional standards and requirements that apply to properties zoned under an existing, underlying zoning district. The overlays are a special tool to help improve the visual quality of commercial corridors when new development and major redevelopment takes place.